

-13-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on February 16, 2007, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-37 are pending in this Application. Claim 1, 13, 25 and 29 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested. The claims have not been amended. Applicant believes that the claim as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,652 to Ingrassia Jr, et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171 to Pacifici et al. (hereinafter Pacifici) and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,670 to Montulli.

The Examiner stated that Ingrassia teaches setting a document property of each document contained in a browser to a common value in response to detecting the intent to initiate a collaboration session. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Ingrassia teaches a Session Id which is synchronized and which is input into a document. Merely placing text into a text box of a document does not qualify as setting a document property of a document. The Examiner further stated (page 4, second full paragraph) that Ingrassia does not teach the step of setting a document domain property of each document contained in a browser to a common value.

Pacifici and Montulli also fail to disclose or suggest "setting a document property of each document contained in the browser to a common value". The Examiner is taking an unreasonable interpretation of "property" to include any piece of text in a document. Clearly then, plain text entered into a text box of a document does not, and should not, qualify as a "property" of the document." Accordingly, none of the prior art discloses or suggests the setting of a document domain property of each document in a browser to a common value. The Examiner stated that Montulli teaches setting a domain name in a cookie. Montulli recites, at column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 4 that the state information is stored in the form of a cookie list (not the cookie itself). A domain name

-14-

value listed within a cookie list does not qualify as a **document domain property** **wherein a document domain property of each document contained in the browser is set to a common value** as recited by claim 1. As recited by the Examiner's own reference, the domain property of a document sets or retrieves the security domain of the document. Further, a cookie list does not qualify as "each document in the browser" as recited by claim 1. None of the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests setting a document domain property of each document in the browser to a common value, as part of a collaboration session. Claims 13, 25 and 29 contain similar elements as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, 26, 28 and 30-35 depend from claim 1, 13, 25 or 29 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. The Examiner's references to prior art not made of record are likewise unconvincing. Nothing provided by the Examiner discloses or teaches setting a document domain property of each document contained in the browser to a common value.

Claims 36-37 disclose wherein the state information includes time sensitive information related to a web page on display within a browser, and participant supplied information used in said collaboration session. The Examiner stated that Ingrassia teaches the same at column 10, lines 3-67. Ingrassia stores a loading time and an unloading time of a document. While these are time related information, they are not time **sensitive** information. Similarly, while a participant ID identifies a participant, the participant ID is not participant supplied information (the participant does not select the participant ID, it is assigned (provided) by another process). Accordingly, claims 36 and 37 are believed to be patentably distinct from the prior art of record.

In view of all the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome pacing the claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

-15-

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David W. Rouille, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 40,150  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-2909

Dated: March 19, 2007